DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 114 646 95 CE 005 519

TITLE COSTAL: Correctional Staff Training for Adult Learning; Final Report and Evaluation.
INSTITUTION Washington School of Psychiatry, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Oct 75
GRANT OEG-0-74-1759
NOTE 19p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Adult Students; Demography; *Program Descriptions; Program Development; *Program Evaluation; Project Training Methods; *Rehabilitation Centers; *Staff Improvement; *Student Characteristics; Training Objectives

ABSTRACT

The COSTAL program provided training and consultation in a variety of formats to a total of 171 halfway house staff members. Students were recruited from 25 halfway houses in Washington D.C. area, and participated in courses in achievement motivation, group dynamics, adult learning, and counseling skills, with college credit available. Three cycles of training were provided, with cycle 1 serving 19 students, cycle 2 serving 18, and cycle 3 (not discussed further) serving 134. Demographic statistics for cycles 1 and 2 include age, sex, race, education, marital status, living arrangements, annual salary, religion, auspices, and related background. Changes in course format from cycle 1 to cycle 2 are discussed, as well as student response. A series of voluntary options which trainees could request was developed, which included videotaped critiques of individual counseling sessions and group sessions at halfway houses, the creation of adult learning centers, and workshops for staff and/or residents. Summary and conclusions state that the program has been a success and should be continued. (LH)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED114646

FINAL REPORT
AND
EVALUATION

C O S T A L
C O R R E C T I O N A L S T A F F T R A I N I N G
F O R
A D U L T L E A R N I N G

A PROJECT OF

WASHINGTON SCHOOL OF PSYCHIATRY
1610 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20009

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

OCTOBER 1975

SUPPORTED BY HEW, U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION
ADULT EDUCATION ACT, SECTION 309(b)
GRANT NO. OEG -0-74-1759

CE005519

WASHINGTON SCHOOL OF PSYCHIATRY/COSTAL
FINAL REPORT AND EVALUATION

JUNE 1, 1974 - JULY 30, 1975

INTRODUCTION

The COSTAL program of the Washington School of Psychiatry concluded operation on August 1, 1975. The purpose of the program as stated in the proposal to the Office of Education was to "improve and change delivery of adult education services to a critical target population with critical adult learning needs: the young men and women residents of halfway houses and community corrections centers in a large metropolitan area..." The manner of improving and changing the delivery service was to be "by providing residential halfway house staff with the educational and interpersonal skills requisite to support effectively the adult learning activities of the halfway house population..."

Early in May, 1974 Mrs. Melmed, Project Director/Administrator, Mr. Dillingham, Training Director, and members of the evaluation team contacted and visited each of the twenty-five halfway houses in the Washington, D.C. area in order to enlist support for the courses. In addition to the obvious gains available to halfway house staff by increasing their skills, the COSTAL program further enhanced its attractiveness by arranging for trainees who completed the courses to obtain college credit from either Washington Technical Institute or Federal City College.

EVALUATION EFFORTS

In order to evaluate the COSTAL effort, the evaluation team engaged in the following: attended planning meetings, attended meetings at halfway houses, attended faculty meetings, observed classes in action, collected data and statistics, interviewed faculty, interviewed (and in some cases video-taped) participants. Dr. Leonard Zeitz was the principal evaluator for this program. ably assisted by Ms. Robinsue Frohboese, and later by Ms. Sheila Zubrod, who were responsible for the daily collection of data and observations.

PROGRAM

The COSTAL program provided training and consultation in a variety of formats to a total of 171 halfway house staff. Thirty-seven of these participants enrolled in and completed the first two cylces of structured quadrupartite training. The exigencies of time, distance, and house staffing patterns caused structured changes in the initial format. As a result COSTAL served thirty-seven trainees in the first two teaching cycles so that in the time slot allocated for the third cycle they broadened their efforts and impact to reach an additional 134 staff, through a variety of formats to be described later.

PARTICIPANTS

In the first cycle 19 students attended. In the second cycle 18 attended. Some selected demographic characteristics are given below for these 37 students. Data on this population were used as a reference rather than as the total trainee population of 200+, as the consistency of training structures and formats of the initial two training cycles lends stability to demographic comparisons.

TABLE I. SOME SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTICIPANTS IN THE COSTAL PROGRAM

CHARACTERISTICS	CYCLE I PARTICIPANTS NUMBER	%	CYCLE II PARTICIPANTS NUMBER	%
AGE				
22 - 25	2	10.5	1	5.6
26 - 29	6	31.6	5	27.7
30 - 34	4	21.1	1	5.6
35 - 39	1	5.2	2	11.1
40 or older	6	31.6	9	50.0
	19	100.0	18	100.0
SEX				
Female	7	36.8	6	33.3
Male	12	61.2	12	66.7
	19	100.0	18	100.0
RACE				
Black	14	74.1	16	88.9
White	5	25.9	2	11.1
	19	100.0	18	100.0
EDUCATION				
Some high school	-	-	3	16.7
High school graduate	3	15.8	2	11.1
Some college	12	63.2	3	16.7
College graduate	2	10.5	3	16.7
Graduate work	2	10.5	7	38.8
	19	100.0	18	100.0
MARITAL STATUS				
Married	10	52.6	9	50.0
Single	3	15.8	2	11.1
Divorced, Separated, Widowed	6	31.6	7	38.9
	19	100.0	18	100.0

Table I. Some Selected Characteristics of Participants in the COSTAL Program (continued)

CHARACTERISTICS	CYCLE I PARTICIPANTS NUMBER	%	CYCLE II PARTICIPANTS NUMBER	%
LIVING ARRANGEMENTS				
Living Alone	5	26.3	6	33.3
With Spouse	2	10.5	6	33.3
With Spouse & Children	8	42.1	3	16.7
With Children	-	-	-	-
Other	4	21.1	3	16.7
	19	100.0	18	100.0
ANNUAL SALARY				
$ 6,000 - $6,999	-	-	3	16.6
$ 7,000 - $7,999	5	25.9	2	11.1
$ 8,000 - $8,999	-	-	3	16.6
$ 9,000 - $9,999	5	25.9	3	16.6
$10,000 or more	9	48.2	7	39.0
	19	100.0	18	99.9*
RELIGION				
Major Western	8	42.1	5	27.7
Eastern	2	10.5	2	11.1
Personal	7	36.8	5	27.7
None	1	5.2	3	16.7
Non-applicable	1	5.2	3	16.7
	19	99.8*	18	99.9*
AUSPICES				
D.C. Dept. of Corrections	9	47.4	2	11.1
Bureau of Rehabilitation	3	15.8	9	50.0
Other	7	36.8	7	38.8
	19	100.0	18	99.9*
RELATED BACKGROUND				
Related Work (e.g., social work, Lorton Guards, etc.)	12	63.2	5	27.7
Personal Experience (i.e., narcotics addiction, court involvement, etc.)	1	5.2	6	33.3
Education (e.g., psychology, sociology degrees, etc.)	4	21.1	6	33.3
	19	100.0	18	99.9*

* Percentage fails to equal 100.0 because of rounding

It should be noted at the outset that a comparison between groups of 19 and 18 persons respectively, suffers statistical reliability since a shift of only one person within any category amounts to more than a five percent shift. Nonetheless some comparisons should be made with the above caveat in mind, if only to indicate possible directions and trends rather than statistically significant statements.

1. Age - Participants in Cycle II are somewhat older than participants in Cycle I. Slightly more than 60% of Cycle II students are 35 years of age or older while about 37% of Cycle I students fall in this category. It is interesting to note that for both cycles, the largest frequencies occur in the over 40 category, and the 26 - 29 year old category.

2. Sex - Males outnumber females about two to one in both cycles. There is no difference in sex distribution for the two cycles.

3. Race - While in both cycles blacks predominate, in Cycle I the ratio is about 3 blacks to 1 white, whereas in Cycle II it is 8 blacks to 1 white.

4. Education - There appears to be a sharp difference in educational attainment in the two cycles. In Cycle I, a majority of almost two thirds has had some college education, and there is very little spread. In Cycle II, more than one in three has done some graduate work, and at the same time 1 in 6 has not completed high school.

5. Marital Status - There are no distinctions. Half or slightly more than half in each cycle are married, and divorced, separated or widowed persons are significantly larger in numbers than are single persons.

6. Living Arrangements - Cycle I trainees are most likely to be living with spouse and child(ren) (42%), whereas Cycle II trainees are more spread throughout the category.

7. Annual Salary - Cycle I trainees were more likely to earn larger salaries than Cycle II trainees. In Cycle I, about 75% earn $9,000 or more annually, whereas in Cycle II, about 56% fall into this category. While in both cycles the greatest frequency is $10,000 or more annually, Cycle II students tend more to spread throughout all the salary ranges.

8. Religion - Rather than elicit the traditional religious choices (e.g., Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, etc.), students were categorized as seen in Table I. For both cycles the major Western and personal religions dominated, but in Cycle II there was more likelihood toward refusal to answer or to reject all religious persuasions.

9. Auspices - There appears to be a significant difference between Cycle I and Cycle II trainees in terms of auspices. While in Cycle I, almost one half come from the District of Columbia Department of Corrections, only about 16% are from the Bureau of Rehabilitation. In Cycle II, however, 50% are

from the Bureau of Rehabilitation, and only 11% are from the Department of Corrections. In both cycles, there is a difference for those coming from other auspices.

10. Related Background - Again, there are distinct differences between the two cycles. In Cycle I, only 1 person (5%) has had previous personal experience as someone caught up in the criminal justice system, but 6 persons (33%) in Cycle II have had such experience. On the other hand, 12 persons in Cycle I (63%) have had related work experience such as military, Lorton guards, etc., whereas only 5 persons in Cycle II (28%) have had similar experiences.

In summary, while the figures should be treated with caution, it appears that the major differences between trainees in the two cycles center upon: auspices, relevant background, education, age and salary. Those in Cycle I tend toward being younger, with less educational attainment, higher salaries, are from the D.C. Department of Corrections, and have had more relevant work experience and less relevant personal experience. Conversely, students in Cycle II tend toward being older, with higher educational attainment, lower salaries, are from the Bureau of Rehabilitation, have had less relevant work experience and more relevant personal experience. Finally, participants in Cycle I tend to cluster within many categories, while participants in Cycle II tend to be more diffuse within many categories.

An additional total of twenty-three persons made initial application to the COSTAL program but are not represented in the previous calculations. Of this group 16 submitted application forms but did not attend any sessions. Seven attended three sessions or less. Of this group attending three sessions or less, 3 left the halfway house system shortly after registering for the course.

A comparison of selected characteristics of these persons with those attending Cycle I and II is seen in Table II below.

TABLE II. SOME SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF COSTAL STUDENTS AND NON-PARTICIPANTS

CHARACTERISTICS	COSTAL STUDENTS (Both Cycles) NUMBER	%	NON-PARTICIPANTS NUMBER	%
AGE				
22 - 25	3	8.1	6	26.1
26 - 29	11	29.7	8	34.8
30 - 34	5	13.5	2	8.7
35 - 39	3	8.1	3	13.0
40 or older	15	40.5	4	17.4
	37	99.9*	23	100.0

* Percentage fails to equal 100.0 because of rounding

Table II. Some Selected Characteristics of COSTAL Participants and non-participants (continued)

CHARACTERISTICS	COSTAL STUDENTS (Both Cycles) NUMBER	%	NON-PARTICIPANTS NUMBER	%
SEX				
Female	13	35.1	10	43.5
Male	24	64.9	13	54.5
	37	100.0	23	100.0
RACE				
Black	30	81.1	16	69.6
White	7	18.9	7	30.4
	37	100.0	23	100.0
EDUCATION				
Some high school	3	8.1	2	8.7
High school graduate	5	13.5	2	8.7
Some College	15	40.5	10	43.5
Graduate work	5	13.5	3	13.0
	9	24.3	6	26.1
	37	99.9*	23	100.0
MARITAL STATUS				
Married	19	51.4	11	47.9
Single	5	13.5	9	39.1
Divorced, Separated, Widowed	13	35.1	3	13.0
	37	100.0	23	100.0
LIVING ARRANGEMENTS				
Living Alone	11	29.7	7	30.4
With Spouse only	8	21.6	5	21.7
With Spouse & Children	11	29.7	6	26.1
With Children only	-	-	3	13.0
With others	7	18.9	2	8.7
	37	99.9*	23	100.0

* Percentage fails to equal 100.0 because of rounding

Table II. Some Selected Characteristics of COSTAL Participants and non-participants (continued)

CHARACTERISTICS	COSTAL STUDENTS (Both Cycles) NUMBER	%	NON-PARTICIPANTS NUMBER	%
ANNUAL SALARY				
$ 6,000 - $6,999	3	8.1	-	-
$ 7,000 - $7,999	7	18.9	4	17.4
$ 8,000 - $8,999	3	8.1	4	17.4
$ 9,000 - $9,999	8	21.6	5	21.7
$10,000 or more	16	43.2	10	43.5
	37	99.9*	23	100.0
RELIGION				
Major Western	13	35.1	11	47.9
Eastern	4	10.8	4	17.4
Personal	12	32.4	5	21.7
None	4	10.8	-	-
Non-applicable	4	10.8	3	13.0
	37	99.9*	23	100.0
AUSPICES				
D.C. Dept. of Corrections	11	29.7	13	56.5
Bureau of Rehabilitation	12	32.4	5	21.7
Other	14	37.8	5	21.7
	37	99.9*	23	99.9*
RELATED BACKGROUND				
Relevant Work	17	45.9	17	73.9
Personal Experience	7	18.9	3	13.0
Education	3	8.1	-	-
None	10	27.0	3	13.0
	37	99.9*	23	99.9*

* Percentage fails to equal 100.0 because of rounding

Again, statistical comparison suffers somewhat because of small numbers. Although the cell sizes are considerably larger than in the previous set of comparisons, the following is subject to the same caveat as above.

1. Age - Non-participants are considerably younger than students. The modal age category for students is 40 or older, whereas for non-participants it is 25 - 29 years of age. About 50% of the students are over 35 years of age; about 61% of the non-participants are below 30 years of age.

2. Sex - Males predominate by a two to one ratio among students, but males comprise a much smaller majority of non-participants.

3. Education - There are no differences.

4. Marital Status - Non-participants tend to comprise a larger proportion of single persons, as would befit a younger population.

5. Living Arrangements - There are no significant differences.

6. Annual Salary - There are no significant differences.

7. Religion - Fewer check personal religion, and a larger proportion checked "major western."

8. Related Background - Overwhelmingly, non-participants had had related work experience; very few had had relevant personal experience, and none had had related educational experiences.

In summary, and with the explicit recognition that the smaller numbers preclude definitive statements about participants and non-participants, one may note that there are some differences between students in Cycle I and students in Cycle II, and that there are sharper differences between students in both cycles and those who expressed interest but who did not participate.

The importance of any set of critical differences is that it may ultimately have an effect upon the COSTAL project. As an example (to be discussed below), faculty in qualitatively assessing the difference in the two cycles attributed the difference to the fact that in Cycle I students frequently came from the D.C. Department of Corrections and in Cycle II they frequently came from the Bureau of Rehabilitation. Furthermore, and as yet impossible to assess, if there are critical differences between participants and non-participants, there is a likelihood that the effects of the COSTAL effort may be altered. As a hypothetical possibility, since participants were older than non-participants, it may be inferred that participants are career persons in residential treatment, and non-participants have not yet ultimately determined their career. Assuming this to be correct, then the COSTAL program should have enormous impact, since those who absorbed COSTAL's material will stay at residential centers, and the others will leave for other jobs.

ATTENDANCE

As previously stated in the Interim Report of the Evaluation Team (February 1, 1975), attendance in Cycle I was erratic, good at the beginning and dropping dramatically at the end. Specific halfway house crises (political and administrative) accounted for this (i.e., the Saxbe decision). These political crises did not occur during Cycle II. Attendance was uniformly substantial throughout.

During the second Cycle Mrs. Melmed and her staff constantly reiterated the need for high attendance through individual phone calls and notes to participants who had missed a class.

GRADES

At the time of the Interim Report, in Cycle I, out of a possible 57 grades, only 23 (40%) grades had been recorded, the remaining majority had been given "incompletes" and had until March 1, 1975 to turn in required term papers and other assignments. It was noted in that time report that an "incomplete" was not necessarily indicative of poor work, but rather that the student was ineligible for college credits. Thus, some trainees in Cycle II not seeking college credits again chose to take incompletes, while most of those seeking such credit completed all of their assignments, as may be seen in Chart I below:

CHART I. COURSES AND GRADES* OF STUDENTS IN CYCLE II ELIGIBLE FOR COLLEGE CREDITS

STUDENT**	SCHOOL	GROUP DYNAMICS GROGNET, INSTRUCTOR	GROUP DYNAMICS JACOBSON, INSTRUCTOR	ADULT LEARNING	COUNSELING SKILLS
1	F.C.C.	C	B	B	Incomplete
2	F.C.C.	C	Not regtrd.	B	B
3	F.C.C.	C	A	B	A
4	F.C.C.	C	A	Not regtrd.	A
5	W.T.I.	Pass	Pass	High Pass	A
6	W.T.I.	Pass	Pass	High Pass	B
7	W.T.I.	Pass	High Pass	High Pass	B
8	W.T.I.	High Pass	High Pass	High Pass	B
9	W.T.I.	Pass	High Pass	High Pass	Incomplete

* No grades given for Achievement Motivation.

** Trainees assigned numbers to preserve their anonymity.

Thus out of 34 possible grades, college credit eligible participants received 32 grades (94.1%), and recorded only two "incompletes." It is obvious that the "incompletes" so remarkable in Cycle I were recorded by those who chose to take particular courses but were not concerned with grades.

Of the 37 trainees going through either of the first two cycles, 24 were eligible for college credits. (Of those 24, only 2 had not completed their requirements as of this writing.) The fact that 2 out of 3 participants were receiving college credits undoubtedly "sweetens" the COSTAL offering but the other fact--that 1 out of 3 were taking the courses solely for their own improvement--is suggestive of the zeal and earnestness of these trainees. Parenthetically, there is no suggestion above that those 24 receiving college credits were taking the courses solely for that purpose; as suggested above, it was simply lagniappe for already highly motivated individuals.

Of the 37 trainees in both of the first two cycles, the following courses were taken (without regard to "incompletes"):

TABLE III. COURSES TAKEN BY PARTICIPANTS IN BOTH OF THE FIRST TWO CYCLES

COURSE	NUMBER	% OF TOTAL PARTICIPANTS
Achievement Motivation	35	94.6
Group Dynamics	32	86.5
Adult Learning	30	81.1
Counseling Skills	29	78.4

As may be seen from the above, the courses were uniformly attractive to the trainees. The COSTAL Newsletter, April 1975 gave a brief description of each of the four courses, and each succinct description is a model calculated to attract the participants. Phases such as the following abound: "How to motivate..., how to use..., what you need to know..., how to identify..., how to develop..., how to choose..." etc. (See: COSTAL Newsletter, April 1975, page 1.)

CYCLE II CLASSES

As described in the Interim Report, the evaluation team recorded Cycle II events by participant observation (virtually every class was covered), interviews with students, and interviews with faculty.

At that time, the general observations of the evaluation team were:

1. Overall, the program was seen as having value by the trainees who also stated that they would recommend COSTAL to their peers.

2. Even while the general overview was favorable, some problems had ensued:

   (a) Participants felt some faculty emphasized unfamiliar programmatic models, and preferred specific and pragmatic material for immediate problem solving within their houses.

   (b) Adult Education used outside resource lecturers who were not well received by the students in general.

   (c) Participants and faculty struggled over a technical language, with faculty opting for this vocabulary as an internalizing process leading to a referential repertoire of identifiable skills.

   (d) The use of a therapeutic community model by the Group Dynamics instructor was objected to by the trainees from the Department of Corrections programs because it was perceived as impractical within the more structural limitations of their Department.

As a result of these and other problems, the COSTAL administration and faculty revised the courses for Cycle II. At the end of Cycle I, participants requested and received additional classes in which an instructor gave two 2-hour lectures on small group orientation. This was institutionalized in Cycle II, so that one instructor

offered 5 classes in practical material and a second instructor offered 5 classes and an all-day workshop dealing with the total life situation of a halfway house.

Second, the instructor in Adult Education dropped all outside lecturers (with one notable exception discussed below), and concentrated upon case orientation and experimental material.

Third, because of the number of "incompletes" in Cycle I the instructor in Counseling Skills required that work assignment be turned in at the middle, rather than at the end of the course, and also shifted its emphasis to a less academic orientation.

Fourth, Achievement Motivation was held at the midpoint of Cycle II, rather than as had been done previously at the end of Cycle I.

Fifth, the instructors in Group Dynamics and Adult Learning offered a team taught combination course.

Finally, a number of voluntary options were offered to the students (see Interim Report, page 5). These have proved so successful that they have become the focus of Cycle III, which is no longer an in-house teaching program but rather a on-site "technical assistance" program (see discussion below).

The task therefore of the evaluation team was to determine what effects, if any, these alterations had made upon the participants' progress.

A. Observations - Training group discussions were more enthusiastic and sustained in Cycle II. The observer notes, however, that one specific unit of didactic material (e.g., lecture on Erikson's Developmental Model, used by the instructors in both Adult Learning and Counseling Skills) received the greatest amount of enthusiastic response from participants.

There was, however, still some conflict between trainees and one instructor in Group Dynamics. The conflict centered on the belief held by students that Grognet was too theoretical in his approach, that the therapeutic community model he espoused did not offer the trainees applicable sets of approaches to their problems. Because these were fewer Department of Corrections persons, problems of applicability diminished but there was some residue of feeling that much that was discussed was too academic and not practical enough. Nonetheless it was this instructor who was most frequently invited to visit the trainee worksites, and to whom a majority of trainees said they would turn to for clinical and programmatic consultation.

The introduction of an instructor (Jacobson) to bridge the gap between the small group and the total life approach was partially successful. The students appreciated Jacobson's approach, but appeared to feel some discontinuity in experiencing two instructors in the span of one course.

Observations of Dillingham's class suggested a much more involved and alert group than had attended Cycle I. Dillingham concentrated upon case work and experiential material. The results were extremely heartening. One student, commenting in class, described Dillingham as initially "easy" and disarming but that in reality "John was as serious as a heart attack about the class."

The Counseling Skills classes of Cycle I met with great enthusiasm, and Thompson's approach in Cycle II (similar to that of Cycle I) was equally well received.

Achievement Motivation was one that charged the participants with excitement and zeal. This continued into Cycle II, and the dynamism of the course led to a third Achievement Motivation weekend, attended by participants from both Cycle I and II. Two volunteers for the COSTAL program learning centers and two counselors recommended by their departments also attended.

B. Trainee Interviews - Twelve of the 18 trainees in Cycle II were interviewed. Again, difficulties in arranging scheduling prevented a universal set of interviews. As in the previous cycle, much effort was made to obtain as many interviews as possible.

As an overall statement, while the participants in Cycle I had been favorable to the program, there was a certain caution in their remarks on many areas of questioning, and favorable statements were frequently tempered with some criticism. In Cycle II, while there was some criticism, the tone was enthusiastic to the point of being qualitatively different from that of Cycle I.

Participants almost unanimously (only one felt the text "too censory" in coverage) saw the text as valuable and praised them as being of continuing use in the future. The same feeling was true of a variety of handouts (reprints of articles, etc.) with only one student seeing no value in them.

When asked about the outstanding class, participants either chose the lecture on Erickson's Developmental Model (used by both Dillingham and Thompson) or the guest lecture by Dr. Marsha Rudman from the University of Massachusetts on practical applications of taking tests. This was offered in the Adult Learning class and met with enthusiasm to the point of fervor, e.g., "Dr. Rudman was marvelous." (Parenthetically, the observer noted four trainees approaching Dillingham after his Erikson lecture to thank him for the presentation.)

Participants were queried on their one field trip to RAP, a local therapeutic community/reeducational environment, led by Grognet. Feelings were equally divided pro and con. One described RAP as "beautiful," another as "its own island in the starry canopy." Those who objected to the field trip either felt that it had no practical value in their own residential setting or that Grognet's enthusiasm for RAP precluded any critical statements.

Work assignments which had caused problems in Cycle I, resulting in many "incompletes" for failure to turn in assignments, were treated far more equitably in Cycle II. While there was some obvious distaste for such assignments, and complaints about inability to find time to do them, others said that the work "really made you dig," or "made you see what you didn't know," or "you had to go back, get more out of the book."

As mentioned earlier, Achievement Motivation was observed to have met with much enthusiasm. Trainee interviews bear out this view. Remarks such as "really useful," "very useful," "tremendous

feeling," abound. Several trainees mentioned that the sessions were fatiguing even while exhilarating.

When asked about Adult Education, an interesting dichotomy was developed. Most praised Dillingham and particularly wanted more direct lectures such as his Erikson lecture. Others objected to Dillingham's use of one adult learner model in class discussions, e.g., "Dillingham shouldn't start class with 'what do you want to know?' He should tell you what to expect." The excitement generated by traditional lecture formats (the Erikson presentation and Dr. Rudman's test taking lecture) was not sustained when the instructor solicited class participation.

Counseling Skills was universally appreciated, several mentioning that it was the most valuable class, others applauding Thompson: "Tommy Thompson stands out in my head," "Thompson really puts over a class." Even where Thompson's style was not appreciated, the class was seen as valuable: "No personal feeling for the man, but I learned the most."

As mentioned previously in the observations section, Group Dynamics was still the focus for conflicts. Jacobson was universally praised, but Grognet received a mixed reaction, e.g., "All I learned from Ron was about RAP," "Only inspired by Ron's first class." Several students commented upon the discontinuity perceived in having two different instructors serially.

When asked if any changes should be made in class, even in alteration the students evinced their enthusiasm, e.g., "Should make Directors of Houses attend," "Would have separated the evening Group Dynamics/Adult Learning as I could get twice as much out of it."

C. Faculty Interviews - Faculty agreed with the evaluation view that the students were more responsive and positive in Cycle II. When asked why this was so, opinions varied. Some felt that the predominance of Bureau of Rehabilitation students was responsible for the shift. Another view held that initial caution about the COSTAL program had been broken down, that Cycle I students returned to their peers with positive views about COSTAL, and that this had generated enthusiasm. Still a third view saw the alterations in the courses as beneficial in sparking student interest. Finally, a fourth view was that as COSTAL shifted from a teaching program to a combined teaching-technical assistance program, this ignited the positive attitude of students. Some faculty views also suggested that the reason Group Dynamics was the focus of conflict was precisely because it impinged directly on the critical issues of halfway house life and this was a catalyst for ventilating frustrations and difficulties of the participants.

D. Summary - The evaluation observation noted that Cycle I courses were generally well done, but with some critical problems and tensions. This was borne out in interviews with trainees and faculty. After changes were made, the evaluation observation noted a great deal more enthusiasm and smoother flowing courses. This too was borne out by interviews with students and faculty. What remains as a problem is: Why the greater enthusiasm in the second cycle? All of the suggestions made by faculty are plausible, but individually they do not appear to be explanatory. The suggestion that the predominance of Bureau of Rehabilitation students in the second cycle and D.C. Department of Corrections students in the first cycle has

some weight. It should be recalled that Corrections students were most vocal in their criticism of RAP used in Group Dynamics as a model, since it could hardly fit the more restrictive natures of their halfway houses. It should also be noted that in the second cycle some participants were still critical of RAP as a model for their more limiting structures. Additionally, while Cycle I was dominated by Corrections personnel, and Cycle II by Rehabilitation personnel, in each session there were 7 trainees from other auspices and that in total for the 2 sessions, trainees from other auspices were in greater number than from either of the 2 major programs.

As to alterations in courses being the critical factor, it must be noted that Adult Learning and Group Dynamics, the courses most altered, are still the most criticized.

The possibility of the "shakedown" period, and that COSTAL has overcome initial suspicions, appears sound but could hardly be proven as the cause for enthusiasm on the part of both faculty and students.

Finally, the last suggestion, that COSTAL's shift to a combination of teaching and technical assistance makes sense, but again cannot be proven.

Please note that the COSTAL brochure emphasizes practicality (e.g., "how to"), and that student criticism centers upon theory or models which have no "practical" value. The technical assistance being given by COSTAL (and to be discussed below) is precisely "practical" and may indeed have provoked much of the positive feelings seen at the end of the Cycle II.

The evaluation is left with a sense of frustration in that it can offer no conclusive statement about causality in the shift from mild approval in Cycle I to enthusiastic approval in Cycle II. Instead it must weasel out by suggesting that some combination or permutation of all factors, with uncertainty of weighting, is responsible for the change.

COSTAL AS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Toward the end of Cycle I, COSTAL announced a series of voluntary options the trainees could request. They included video-taped critiques and consultation of group sessions at halfway houses, creation of adult learning centers, workshops for staff and/or residents, and video-taped critiques of individual counseling sessions. The response has been overwhelmingly favorable, and has led to this approach as the emphasis in Cycle III rather than to use Cycle II for traditional teaching purposes.

As examples of trainee requests and COSTAL responses:

Adult Learning Centers have been established at CCC #2 and the Residential Treatment Center with such success that 10 other Houses have requested learning centers. They include four houses from the Bureau of Rehabilitation, four from the D.C. Department of Corrections, and two from other auspices.

Jacobson and Thompson observed and critiqued a session at Crossroads for a staff of 10.

Grognet and Jackson video-taped and critiqued a group session at Shaw #3 for 10 residents and staff.

Melmed and Dillingham video-taped and critiqued a workshop for volunteers at Passage, involving fifty people. (There was also a follow-up to this session with two of the staff people.)

Thompson directed a staff training session at D.C. Veterans Home (Mary Herring Alcoholic Treatment Center).

Dillingham taught 3 casework and problem-solving seminars at CCC #2, attended by a staff of twelve, and has been requested to provide regular, on-going consultation and training.

Grognet video-taped and critiqued a staff session of ten at the second Genesis House.

A special note should be added about the adult learning centers since they have been significantly and overwhelmingly appreciated. COSTAL has supplied to halfway houses which request this service the following: a packet of materials relating to adult testing, a small sum of money for the purchase of decorations (e.g., posters, etc.) for the adult learning centers, 8 or 10 chairs (purchased from the Washington School of Psychiatry for a nominal fee), and expertise of its staff.

That this program is precisely the kind of practical program desired by the participants is attested to by the response. One trainee has even gone so far as to reproduce, for distribution, an article on adult education in a correctional setting, and has devised a program chart relating the Adult Learning Center to the halfway house in which it is established.

ADDENDUM

In any evaluation, there are bits and pieces which defy easy pigeonholing into headings, subheadings, and the like. They are generally anecdotal or impressionistic rather than totally "factual;" but nonetheless deserve statement, In this category fall the following:

(a) Three participants have been so impressed and so influenced by COSTAL that they have been motivated to return to college.

(b) As noted previously, trainees from the D.C. Department of Corrections have been most vocally critical, primarily because their programs are more restraining and less permissive than the "ideal" halfway house structure.

The administration and faculty were aware of and concerned in advance with the problems which the Corrections staff would present. In spite of these problems, COSTAL is in possession of a letter (see attached) written by Charles Rodgers, Assistant Director of Operations, Community Services Division, D.C. Department of Corrections, in which he warmly praises the program, speaks of the great value to his personnel, and offers his Department's continued

participation in the COSTAL effort. The letter's magnanimity of language, from the most critical segment of the student body, is praise enough for the program's efforts.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In a traditional evaluation, primary emphasis would have fallen upon impact, i.e., did COSTAL accomplish what it set out to accomplish (or to what degree did it accomplish its objectives). In the time span available we have not gathered the more technical longitudinal data, but we do have impressionistic data. As a consequence, the evaluation has chosen to translate the material as narrated in the above account. Nontheless, with some obesiances to traditional evaluation, we offer the following, using normal rubrics of evaluation.

1. Efficiency - While not specifically noting efficiency as a rubric, the narrative above is replete with evidences of a highly-geared machine. Faculty meetings have been run smoothly, classes have been scheduled with accuracy, the myriad paper work necessary for such an operation has been completed always on time, distribution of material or setting up of meetings has always virtually been taken for granted because of the smoothness of flow. Additionally, when changes were necessary, in Cycle II e.g., the shifts in course content or the shift to technical assistance, the administration and faculty have moved with alacrity and cooperativeness. It is this evaluator's view that in terms of efficiency, COSTAL has been a model of its kind, and the entire administration and faculty are to be commended.

2. Effectiveness - As mentioned above, the COSTAL program has not yet had time to prove its effectiveness as it relates to the residents of halfway houses. Nevertheless it has demonstrated its capability in up-grading counselor skills, the first step in proving its effectiveness. COSTAL has motivated some participants to seek further education; has influenced some participants to initiate, with the help of COSTAL personnel, programs within their individual halfway houses; has been universally praised by these participants (even while some criticism remains); and has received approval from the Department most likely to be critical of its approaches. The ultimate proof of COSTAL's impact effectiveness lies in the future as it relates to counselor efforts directed toward residents, but the initial impact upon the counselors is almost self-evident as beneficial and constructive.

3. Social Value. Again, ultimate social value lies in what happens to clients as a result of counselor upgrading. Being convinced that such upgrading is well on its way, one must assume that clients will benefit, and any benefits which return these troubled people to their communities as more able to adapt positively must be regarded as having social value.

In conclusion, it is evident that in spite of whatever problems COSTAL has had, the evaluation considers it a remarkably successful and commendable program, and offers the following suggestions for the future:

1. COSTAL should continue its teaching program, making whatever modifications are necessary as it learns from the trainees what is desired and needed.

2. COSTAL should continue its on-site technical assistance programs which have been proven to be valuable contributions to halfway houses.

3. COSTAL should consider special teaching programs for administrators and directors of halfway houses, so that they too will understand the nature of the innovations requested by their personnel as a result of COSTAL teaching.

4. COSTAL should consider the possibilities of replicating the program in other jurisdictions. The valuable lessons garnered by the program should not benefit the D.C. area solely. A manual should be considered which would combine video-tape and printed or reproduced material, and which would have national value (even permitting space for regional or local inputs and variations).

5. COSTAL should consider a second year evaluation to determine what is now accepted as an article of faith, namely that the upgrading of counselor skills will have the anticipated effects upon residents of halfway houses.